

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action mailed October 10, 2006, was received and its contents carefully reviewed. Claims 1-56 were previously pending in the present application.

A. Previous Communications and Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Al-Hashemi and Examiner Rimell for their help and consideration in the personal interview conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on December 6, 2006. Applicants would also like to thank Supervisory Examiner Ronces for facilitating the interview. During the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiners discussed proposed amendments to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 101. Additionally, Applicants' representative and the Examiners discussed proposed cancellation of claims 25-26 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

B. Remarks Regarding Amendments

In the above amendments, Applicant amended claims 1, 22, 23, 24, and 29 to highlight additional features of the present invention and to add additional context to the claims. Namely, Applicant amended the claims to clarify the party assigning a manufacturer SKU, to clarify the link from the product data to product information characterizing the product, and to specifically recite the output of the catalog to a user to display the captured data. The features incorporated in the above amendments are disclosed throughout the original Specification and Figures at least on page 7, lines 10-15; page 21, lines 2-18; and throughout pages 24-26 and 31. Additional support for claims 25-56 may be found at least on pages 7 (claims 25-27), 13 (claim 28), 21 (claims 29-33), and 26 (claims 34, 35) and throughout the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was introduced by these amendments. Additionally, Applicants cancelled claims 25-28 and 36-56. As now recited, claims 1-24 and claims 29-35 are pending and are believed to be in condition

for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

C. Previous Restriction Requirement

Previously, on February 9, 2006, Applicants filed an Election in response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement mailed on January 9, 2006. Applicants elected with traverse Species I, namely claims 1-26 and claims 29-35. In Applicants' previous response filed on June 30, 2006, Applicants requested reconsideration of the Examiner's Restriction Requirement with respect to Species III (claims 36-49) and Species IV (claims 50-56). As indicated in the response to the restriction requirement, full consideration and examination of elected Species I would necessarily encompass the invention of Species III and IV. However, in view of the above amendments and cancellation of claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the election with traverse is now moot, and Applicants may pursue the previously-restricted claims in divisional applications. As currently recited, claims 1-26 and 29-35 directed to Species I are pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that claims 1-24 and 29-35 be passed to issue.

D. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-24, and claim 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In view of the amendments above and the additional explanations offered and discussed in the personal interview of December 6, 2006, namely that the recited claims allow the system SKU, the manufacturer SKU, and the customer SKU to be the same representative identifier (such as an alphanumeric identifier) or different representative identifiers as dictated by the entity assigning the respective SKU. For example, the system SKU may be an alphanumeric identifier such as "A1234." The manufacturer SKU assigned by the manufacturer may be the same alphanumeric identifier, A1234, or it may be an entirely different identifier. Similarly, the customer

SKU may also be alphanumeric identifier A1234 or it may be a third, distinct identifier. Regardless of the actual identifiers assigned as the respective SKUs, the product data includes these at least three identifiers when the product data is stored in the product data system.

Additionally, the specification is replete with examples of customers and SKU numbers related to the customers. Customers may be manufacturers, distributors, and resellers, to name a few. See lines 7-9 on page 6 of the present Specification. Further, additional details with regard to the product data is included in the Specification at least on page 7, lines 10-15; page 21, lines 2-18; and throughout pages 24-26, and 31-33.

In view of the amendments above and these remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-24 and claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

E. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

On page 4 of the Office Action mailed October 10, 2006, the Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. § 101 and asserts that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of the amendments above with regard to the output of the catalog to a user to display the captured data, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-24 and 29-35 comply with the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101 by producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-24 and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.


F. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by King Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,319,542. As indicated above, Applicants canceled claims 25-28 in the above amendments. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is moot.

G. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record and allow claims 1-24 and claims 29-35 in the present application to issue. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be beneficial in expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph A. Parisi
Registration No. 53,435

MSK/JAP

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W. Suite 900
Washington D.C. 20004
(202) 585-8000
(202) 585-8080 (Fax)